

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS


In response to the Office Action mailed March 9, 2006 finally rejecting many claims, Applicant proposes to amend his application and requests reconsideration in view of the proposed amendment and following remarks. It is proposed in this Amendment to cancel claims 10, 16, and 18 leaving claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 14, 15, and 17 pending.

Claims 15 and 17 were rejected as not supported by the application as filed. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Since claims 16 and 18, which respectively depended from claims 15 and 17, were not similarly rejected, claims 15 and 17 are amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 16 and 18, respectively. These amendments change the description of the enclosure from being thermally insulating to being a plastic. The Examiner is apparently requiring verbatim agreement between the patent application and the claims. Essentially, the rejection is one for undue breadth, a concept that has no application to mechanical inventions as claimed in the present patent application. Clearly, a plastic is a thermal insulator as recognized by the Examiner. In any event, the Amendment overcomes the rejection as to claims 15 and 17.

While many claims were rejected over prior art, the Examiner stated that claims 10 and 11 were only objected to and not rejected. In this Amendment claim 10 is rewritten in independent form as amended claim 1. Claim 11 is amended as to its dependency in view of the cancellation of claim 10. The only other amendments made here are discussed above.

In view of the concession concerning the allowability of claims 10 and 11, this Amendment clearly places the application in form for allowance which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey A. Wyand, Reg. No. 29,458
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: _____
JAW:ves

May 31, 2006